

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| ARNOLD N. YOUNG, |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Civil Action No. 13-0431 (RBW) |
| |) | |
| UNITED STATES |) | |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE <i>et al.</i> , |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondents. |) | |
| |) | |

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on the Federal Respondents’ Opposition to Petitioner’s Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (“Gov’t’s Opp’n”), ECF No. 8. By Order issued on June 27, 2013, ECF No. 9, the petitioner was advised to reply to the government’s opposition by July 29, 2013, or risk summary denial of the petition and dismissal of the case. The petitioner has neither filed a response nor sought additional time to do so. The Court therefore will dismiss the case on the respondents’ uncontested arguments documenting to the Court’s satisfaction why the writ should not issue. *See* Gov’t’s Opp’n at 3-9; 28 U.S.C. § 2248 (2006) (“The allegations of . . . an answer to an order to show cause in a habeas corpus proceeding, if not traversed, shall be accepted as true except to the extent that the judge finds from the evidence that they are not true.”); *see also* Local Civil Rule 7(b) (unopposed dispositive motion may be treated as conceded); *Slovinec v. Amer. Univ.*, 520 F. Supp. 2d 107, 111 (D.D.C. 2007) (treating uncontested arguments in a dispositive motion as conceded).¹

DATE: November 8, 2013

_____/s/
Reggie B. Walton
United States District Judge

¹ A separate final order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.